

A retrospective comparison of intensity-modulated arc therapy and 3-dimensional conformal approaches in the planning of grade 3 gliomas

SHEAZADI, Lubna, APPLEBYARD, Robert <<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-8882-6813>>, FOLEY, Natalie and FORAN, Bernadette

Available from Sheffield Hallam University Research Archive (SHURA) at:

<http://shura.shu.ac.uk/21558/>

This document is the author deposited version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

Published version

SHEAZADI, Lubna, APPLEBYARD, Robert, FOLEY, Natalie and FORAN, Bernadette (2018). A retrospective comparison of intensity-modulated arc therapy and 3-dimensional conformal approaches in the planning of grade 3 gliomas. *Journal of Radiotherapy in Practice*.

Copyright and re-use policy

See <http://shura.shu.ac.uk/information.html>

Journal of Radiotherapy in Practice

A retrospective comparison of Intensity Modulated Arc Therapy and 3-Dimensional conformal approaches in the planning of grade 3 gliomas.

--Manuscript Draft--

Manuscript Number:	JRP-D-17-00074R1
Full Title:	A retrospective comparison of Intensity Modulated Arc Therapy and 3-Dimensional conformal approaches in the planning of grade 3 gliomas.
Article Type:	Original Article
Section/Category:	Treatment Planning
Keywords:	Intensity modulated arc therapy; High-grade glioma; 3D conformal radiotherapy; Radiotherapy planning; Dose volume histograms.
Corresponding Author:	Lubna Sheazadi, BSc Radiotherapy & Oncology Sheffield Hallam University BRADWAY, UNITED KINGDOM
Corresponding Author Secondary Information:	
Corresponding Author's Institution:	Sheffield Hallam University
Corresponding Author's Secondary Institution:	
First Author:	Lubna Sheazadi, BSc Radiotherapy & Oncology
First Author Secondary Information:	
Order of Authors:	Lubna Sheazadi, BSc Radiotherapy & Oncology
	Robert Appleyard, PhD
	Natalie Foley, BSc
	Bernadette Foran, FRCR
Order of Authors Secondary Information:	
Manuscript Region of Origin:	UNITED KINGDOM
Abstract:	<p>Purpose: To evaluate the extent to which intensity modulated arc therapy (IMAT) for high-grade gliomas is comparable to 3-dimensional conformal radiotherapy (3DCRT) in relation to the dose delivered to normal brain tissue, PTV conformity and the dose delivered to brainstem and optic chiasma.</p> <p>Method: Sixteen randomly selected 3DCRT treatment plans of grade 3 gliomas were re-planned using an IMAT planning technique and dose-volume histograms were compared. Primary outcomes were maximum, mean, 1/3 and 2/3 doses to normal brain tissue (NBT) outside the PTV and maximum, mean, D50 and D20 doses to PTV. Secondary outcomes were maximum and mean doses to the brainstem and optic chiasm. Wilcoxon signed rank test was used to compare data.</p> <p>Results: IMAT led to a statistically significant increase in mean dose to NBT (34.4 v 33.3 Gy, (p = 0.047) but a statistically significant reduction in maximum dose to NBT (62.7 v 63.8 Gy, p = 0.004) compared to 3DCRT. IMAT led to statistically significant reductions in maximum, D50 and D20 doses to the PTV (63.3 v 64.7 Gy, p = 0.001; 60.0 v 60.7 Gy, p = 0.001 and 60.5 v 61.8 Gy, p = 0.002 respectively). No statistically significant differences were seen in doses to brainstem and optic chiasm.</p> <p>Conclusion: IMAT is at least comparable to 3DCRT in relation to minimising dose to normal brain tissue and ensuring good PTV conformity. Doses delivered to OARs using IMAT were also comparable to 3DCRT. This study supports the continued use of IMAT for the treatment of high-grade gliomas.</p>

A retrospective comparison of Intensity Modulated Arc Therapy and 3-Dimensional conformal approaches in the planning of grade 3 gliomas

SHEAZADI, Lubna (BSc)¹, APPLEYARD, Robert (PhD)², FOLEY, Natalie (BSc)³ and FORAN, Bernadette (FRCR)⁴

^{1,2}Faculty of Health and Wellbeing, Sheffield Hallam University, Sheffield, UK, ^{3,4}Sheffield Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust, Weston Park Hospital, Sheffield, UK

Correspondence to: Lubna Sheazadi, Address: Collegiate Crescent, Sheffield, S10 2BP, Tel: +44 (0) 114 225 5555, E-mail: lubnaskhan@hotmail.com

Abstract

Purpose: To evaluate the extent to which intensity modulated arc therapy (IMAT) for high-grade gliomas is comparable to 3-dimensional conformal radiotherapy (3DCRT) in relation to the dose delivered to normal brain tissue, PTV conformity and the dose delivered to brainstem and optic chiasma.

Method: Sixteen randomly selected 3DCRT treatment plans of grade 3 gliomas were re-planned using an IMAT planning technique and dose-volume histograms were compared. Primary outcomes were maximum, mean, 1/3 and 2/3 doses to normal brain tissue (NBT) outside the PTV. Also the maximum, mean, D50 and D20 doses to PTV. Secondary outcomes were maximum and mean doses to the brainstem and optic chiasm. Wilcoxon signed rank test was used to compare data.

Results: IMAT led to a statistically significant increase in mean dose to NBT (34.4 v 33.3 Gy, ($p = 0.047$)) but a statistically significant reduction in maximum dose to NBT (62.7 v 63.8 Gy, $p = 0.004$) compared to 3DCRT. IMAT led to statistically significant reductions in maximum, D50 and D20 doses to the PTV (63.3 v 64.7 Gy, $p = 0.001$; 60.0 v 60.7 Gy, $p = 0.001$ and 60.5 v 61.8 Gy, $p = 0.002$ respectively). No statistically significant differences were seen in doses to brainstem and optic chiasm.

Conclusion: IMAT is at least comparable to 3DCRT in relation to minimising dose to normal brain tissue and ensuring good PTV conformity. Doses delivered to OARs using IMAT were also comparable to 3DCRT. This study supports the continued use of IMAT for the treatment of high-grade gliomas.

Keywords: Intensity modulated arc therapy; High-grade glioma; 3D conformal radiotherapy; Radiotherapy planning; Dose volume histograms.

Introduction

Gliomas are the most common primary tumours of the central nervous system and their management has historically been one of the most challenging fields in medicine.¹

Malignant gliomas are widely infiltrative in their extension with indistinct tumour margins that are difficult to accurately define^{2, 3} and delivering radiotherapy is complex due to the proximity between tumour and organs at risk (OAR).

Cognitive symptoms for patients with high-grade gliomas (HGG) can vary from acute to chronic memory loss, personality change, confusion, speech problems and severe headaches.³ Other common symptoms of HGG include muscle weakness, visual symptoms, and changes in sensation.⁴ Alongside the neurocognitive damage caused by the tumour, the effect of radiation to normal brain tissue (NBT) also results in cognitive impairment⁵ and can be one of the more troubling side-effects of radiotherapy to the brain.^{6,7}

In practice many departments have progressed to *intensity modulated arc therapy* (IMAT) also referred to as RapidArc and *volumetric-modulated arc therapy* (VMAT) from the manufacturers of Varian and Elekta respectively. VMAT techniques make it easier to target brain tumours whilst reducing dose to critical structures nearby^{3,7}. Such damage limitation strategies are increasingly important for the long term clinical outcome of patients with HGG who are benefiting from combined chemo-radiation programmes.⁸ However, a recent review by Teoh et al.³ has raised concerns regarding the progress to IMAT as the optimal method of treatment delivery; specifically with regards the dose to NBT from IMAT compared to 3-dimensional conformal radiotherapy (3DCRT).

As survival outcomes improve for patients with HGG^{3, 8}, an increase in number of patients suffering from late effects of radiation may also be possibly seen. Hence, innovative methods to minimise treatment-related, long-term toxicities are needed to further improve outcomes for these patients.⁹

Purpose

This study was a service evaluation of local department practice which has progressed from 3DCRT to IMAT as the standard technique used for treating brain tumours. This study set out to compare dose volume histograms (DVH) of previously treated 3DCRT plans with corresponding IMAT plans based on the same patient data. The primary outcome was the maximum, mean, 1/3 and 2/3 doses to the NBT outside of the planning target volume (PTV) see [Table 1](#). The maximum, mean, D50 and D20 doses to the PTV were also analysed ([Table 2](#)). The D50 was analysed as this is the median dose to the PTV. The D20 is where the highest dose is received by 20% of the PTV. D20 was evaluated as a measure of the homogeneity of the dose within the PTV, according to department protocol; the maximum dose, Dmax, was used rather than D98 as this metric is used in the department protocol. Secondary outcomes were maximum and mean doses to the brainstem and optic chiasm ([Table 3](#)).

Method

Sixteen 3DCRT treatment plans of WHO grade 3 gliomas created between 2011 and 2013 were randomly selected. The sample size is comparable with similar studies.¹⁰⁻¹³

The 3DCRT treatment plans were prescribed 60 Gy in 30 fractions, and calculated with 6MV photons, adhering to department protocols. All patients were immobilised supine in a beam direction shell.

The 3DCRT treatment plans contours were based on ICRU report 50 & 62.^{14, 15} Gross tumour volume (GTV) was defined as the contrast-enhancing tumour on a T1-weighted magnetic resonance image fused with a computed tomography (CT) scan, both 2.5mm slice thickness. The GTV and the post-operative tumour bed were expanded by 2.5cm (in three dimensions) within anatomic routes of spread to create the clinical target volume (CTV). Any oedema noted on the scans was also included in the CTV. The CTV was then expanded isotropically by 0.5cm to create the PTV. Contoured OARs were the brainstem, optic chiasm, right and left optic nerves, retinas, lenses, lacrimals and the normal brain. Treatment plan 2, did not have the optic chiasm contoured owing to increased distance between the tumour and the optic chiasm.

IMAT Planning

The 3DCRT treatment plans were re-planned with the IMAT technique using the Eclipse Varian Medical Planning System version 13.6 (Varian Medical Systems, Palo Alto, CA). The addition of ICRU report 83¹⁶ was used for creating the IMAT treatment plans. For the purpose of this study it was decided to use ‘like for like’ with the prescription of 60 Gy in 30 fractions.

The OARs were at least two slices thick, so that meaningful DVH could be calculated. A margin of 3mm planning risk volume (PRV) was added to the OARs. Where the PTV overlapped an OAR, the overlap region was designated only as OAR rather than PTV, using the ‘Boolean’ technique and creating an additional PTV. Therefore the original PTV was modified to exclude the OAR, as illustrated by the exclusion of the brainstem from the PTV in [Figure 1](#). None of the CTVs overlapped with OARs.

The IMAT plans were created with two goals in mind: firstly to achieve PTV coverage without violating PTV conformity, OAR doses and avoid hotspots. Secondly to reduce OAR doses as much as possible without compromising the PTV coverage and conformity. Following department protocol the maximum dose within the PTV was 105% and the minimum dose within the PTV was 95%.

IMAT plans were created using two full gantry rotation arcs. Several studies have found that the use of two arcs result in better plan quality as using a single arc is insufficient to achieve dose constraints.^{3, 10, 11}

Analysis

A comparative visual dosimetric analysis was performed on the thirty-two CTs and the DVHs of each treatment plan were statistically compared. The statistical analysis of tolerance doses for the NBT, brainstem and optic chiasm were made using the QUANTEC dose tolerance data by Marks et al.¹⁷ and the department protocol as surrogate ([Table 4](#)).

Mean doses were not considered clinically relevant for the serial OARs: optic chiasm, and brainstem, but was relevant for the parallel OARs: retina and lens¹⁷⁻¹⁹, so it was

ensured that ipsi-lateral (if possible) and contra-lateral doses to OAR were within their tolerance.

The Wilcoxon matched-pair signed-rank test for non-parametrically distributed data was used to compare the means between 3DCRT and IMAT treatment plans. All statistical tests were two-tailed. SPSS software version 24 was used for statistical analysis.

Results

Tables 1, 2 and 3 illustrate the results for NBT, PTV and OAR data respectively.

Figures 2, 3 and 4 illustrate the data in boxplot form. Extreme outliers are marked with an asterisk (*) on the boxplot and mild outliers are marked with a circle (○) on the boxplot.²⁰

Discussion

Study findings

3DCRT and IMAT technique treatment plans for patients with HGGs (grade 3) were analysed. The first question addressed was; which is the better technique in regards to delivering a lower integral dose to the NBT outside of the PTV? The second question addressed was; which technique was better in regards to optic chiasm and brainstem (OAR) sparing. The PTV coverage was also assessed to determine if low dose to the NBT and OAR sparing was achieved at the cost of PTV coverage.

Through IMAT, a larger volume of NBT was typically irradiated with a small dose resulting in an overall higher dose; this is illustrated in Figure 5.

This study found that the PTV coverage using 3DCRT decreased significantly if located nearby the brainstem Figure 1 and optic chiasm Figure 7. This was because the dose limits were lower to the OAR (Table 4), in comparison to the prescribed dose aimed at the tumour (60 Gy). Wagner et al.¹¹ noted that the PTV coverage decreased to 68.2% of the volume covered by the prescribed dose using 3DCRT. This is because the single fraction to OAR had to be reduced to 1.8 Gy; reducing the dose to the tumour

concurrently. This implicates the lower biological dose delivered to the tumour. Wagner et al.¹¹ concluded that these patients should therefore not be treated with 3DCRT technique due to the close proximity of PTV and OAR.

A significant difference was shown (Table 1 and Figure 2) between the two techniques for NBT mean ($p=0.047$) and NBT max ($p=0.004$). However it is important to consider that the Wilcoxon signed rank test illustrates p-value based on the range difference. The NBT is not defined as an OAR because planners experience with Eclipse has shown for HGG that the brain dose is not reduced with the use of normal brain planning goals. The volume of PTV affects the dose the NBT receives, for example if the PTV is covering 1/3 of the NBT then it is difficult for the dose to be within tolerance. Thus, the likelihood of a small difference in increase or reduced dose to the NBT being clinically significant is modest when treating a high volume of the brain to a high total dose. Hence, it is important to not use the statistical values alone in order to reach a conclusion.

A reduction of NBT max with IMAT from 63.76 Gy to 62.73 Gy is unlikely to lead to a noticeable reduction in symptomatic necrosis based on the Quantec data¹⁷. This reduction in IMAT dose for NBT max possibly balances the small increase by IMAT for NBT mean. The average difference in dose for the NBT 1/3 was +2.3 Gy more delivered by IMAT, but no significant difference ($p=0.134$) was illustrated, whereas this difference in actual dose is generous, based on the prescription dose.

Therefore, based on this analysis of a small sample, there is probably no clinically important difference for NBT outcomes.

The statistical data for PTV max, mean, D50 and D20 doses was comparable between both techniques (Table 2). The IMAT techniques offer good PTV coverage and conformity even when the PTV was close to OARs (Figure 1 and 7). Only parts of the PTV, overlapping with an OAR, achieved a lower dose of approximately 54 Gy to the PTV in PRV created.

Depending on the PTV location, not all OARs can be taken in to the optimisation process. This was also evident in the Sharyan et al.¹⁰ study, in which the maximum dose to the right optic nerve was higher than left optic nerve due to the tumour position being on the right. However, in our study the DVH of treatment plan 1 shows higher dose delivered with IMAT to the NBT, whereas treatment plan 4 illustrated an overall higher dose delivered with 3DCRT (Figure 6). Sharyan et al.¹⁰ demonstrated that there were no significant differences in the PTV conformity index between the two modalities ($p=0.462$).

Sharyan et al.¹⁰ found the brainstem maximum dose was within the tolerance criteria <54 Gy for IMAT but exceeded the criteria in 3DCRT at 60.97 Gy. Our study found a small but statistically significant difference for the brainstem mean between the two techniques ($p=0.044$), demonstrating an increase in maximum dose $+2.39$ Gy to the brainstem with IMAT (Table 3 and Figure 4). The DVHs of treatment plan 5 demonstrated equal doses delivered to the brainstem using both techniques. Whereas for plan 4 and 11 the IMAT dose had a steeper drop off as desired in radiotherapy treatment. The brainstem and optic chiasm are serial organs, so it is vital to maintain their dose within tolerance¹⁷.

The optic chiasm max and mean doses were comparable with both modalities. Similar to Sharyan et al.¹⁰ study in which the optic chiasms were within tolerance levels for both techniques. In our study IMAT was able to spare the brainstem and optic chiasm for more treatments plans. Thus patients with a tumour nearby optic chiasm and brainstem may benefit treatment with IMAT. Figure 7 illustrates the difference in dose delivered by both techniques to the optic chiasm in DVHs.

Our study and evidence from previous studies^{11-13, 21} demonstrated that IMAT can lead to reductions in maximum doses delivered to critical structures but at the expense of increased mean dose to the NBT. There is currently insufficient evidence to demonstrate if the increase in dose to NBT compared to the reduced dose to OARs is statistically or clinically significant. It is important to acknowledge that the Quantec data by Marks et al.¹⁷ was produced based on data using 3DCRT techniques, so can not be equally

applicable to the relatively new IMAT techniques. Nevertheless, it is evident that IMAT does lead to better PTV coverage.

Limitations

It is important to consider that the 3DCRT treatment plans used in this study were phased treatments. The 1st phase delivered 2 Gy per fraction to the PTV even if there was OARs involved, and the 2nd phase of the treatment resulted in large uncovered areas in the PTV affecting the PTV's overall coverage and conformity.

In this study planning goals for each treatment plan were met so it was deemed 'clinically acceptable'. The planner in this study did not continue optimising to achieve the best plan possible due to time constraints. Further optimisation may have led to larger differences than those seen in [tables 1-3](#).

This study did not set out to evaluate time differences but, as identified by Sharyan et al.¹⁰, it was noted that IMAT techniques required longer to plan. However, advantages of IMAT (relating to PTV coverage and OAR sparing) may outweigh the limitations associated with additional planning time.

Furthermore lower number of monitor units with IMAT, implies less scattered radiation¹² and significant reduction of delivery time demonstrated in many studies.¹⁰⁻¹³ Consequently, organ motion during treatment delivery is less problematic and patient comfort is enhanced through as time spent immobilised in a beam direction shell is reduced. Patient throughput may also be increased as a result of reduced treatment times.

HGG are classified as grade 3 and 4. Our study included only grade 3 whereas other studies included patients with both grade and so definitive comparisons are not possible.

Conclusion

Our evaluation found that IMAT was at least comparable to 3DCRT in relation to minimising dose to normal brain tissue and ensuring good PTV conformity. Improved PTV conformity with IMAT was particularly noted in cases where the PTV was in close proximity to OARs. Similarly doses delivered to OARs using IMAT were also comparable to 3DCRT.

This study supports the continued use of IMAT for the treatment of high-grade gliomas.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to acknowledge Dr Chris Bragg and all the Clinical Technicians at Weston Park Hospital. With thanks to the Sheffield Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust for granting permission for this project to be carried out.

Financial Support

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

Conflicts of interest

None.

References

1. Barnett G H. *High-grade gliomas: diagnosis and treatment*. Humana Press, Totowa, NJ, Springer 2007.
2. Stupp R, Hegi M E, Mason W P, van den Bent M J, Taphoorn M J, Janzer R C, et al. Effects of radiotherapy with concomitant and adjuvant temozolomide versus radiotherapy alone on survival in glioblastoma in a randomised phase III study: 5-year analysis of the EORTC-NCIC trial. *The lancet oncology*. 2009; 10(5):459-66.
3. Teoh M, Clark C H, Wood K, Whitaker S, Nisbet A. Volumetric modulated arc therapy: a review of current literature and clinical use in practice. *The British journal of radiology*. 2011; 84(1007):967-96.
4. Batchelor T. *Patient information: High-grade glioma in adults (Beyond the Basics)*. [online] 2017. <http://www.uptodate.com/contents/high-grade-glioma-in-adults-beyond-the-basics>. Last accessed on 28 March 2018.
5. Schagen S B, Klein M, Reijneveld J C, Brain E, Deprez S, Joly F, Scherwath A, et al. Monitoring and optimising cognitive function in cancer patients: present knowledge and future directions. *European Journal of Cancer Supplements*. 2014;12(1):29-40.
6. Ricard D, Idhah A, Ducray F, Lahutte M, Hoang-Xuan K, Delattre JY. Primary brain tumours in adults. *The Lancet*. 2012;379(9830):1984-96.
7. Symonds P, Deehan C, Mills J. and Meredith, C. (2012) *Walter and Miller's textbook of radiotherapy*. 7th Ed., Edingburgh; Elsevier Churchill Livingstone
8. Mirimanoff R O, Gorlia T, Mason W, Van den Bent M J, Kortmann R D, Fisher B, Reni M, et al. Radiotherapy and temozolomide for newly diagnosed glioblastoma: recursive partitioning analysis of the EORTC 26981/22981-NCIC CE3 phase III randomized trial. *Journal of clinical oncology*. 2006;24(16):2563-9.
9. Panet-Raymond V, Ansbacher W, Zavgorodni S, Bendorffe B, Nichol A, Truong P T, et al. Coplanar versus noncoplanar intensity-modulated radiation therapy (IMRT) and volumetric-modulated arc therapy (VMAT) treatment planning for fronto-temporal high-grade glioma. *Journal of applied clinical medical physics*. 2012;13(4):44-53.
10. Sharyan H A, Allehyani S H, & Tolba A R. Dosimetric Comparison of 3DCRT Versus RapidArc in Terms of Iso-dose Distribution, Dose Volume Histogram (DVH) and Dosimetric Results for the PTV and Critical Organs for Glioblastoma (GBM). *American Journal of Medicine and Medical Sciences* 2015; 5 (5): 208-219.
11. Wagner D, Christiansen H, Wolff H, & Vorwerk H. Radiotherapy of malignant gliomas: comparison of volumetric single arc technique (RapidArc), dynamic intensity-modulated technique and 3D conformal technique. *Radiotherapy and Oncology*, 2009; 93 (3): 593-596.

12. Goswami B, Mitra S, Banerjee S, Shiva B, Nagendran P, Kumari P, et al. RapidArc: Initial experience in high grade glioma. *International journal of radiation research*. 2013;11(4):203-6.
13. Shaffer R, Nichol A M, Vollans E, Fong M, Nakano S, Moiseenko V, et al. A comparison of volumetric modulated arc therapy and conventional intensity-modulated radiotherapy for frontal and temporal high-grade gliomas. *International Journal of Radiation Oncology• Biology• Physics*. 2010;76(4):1177-84.
14. International Commission On Radiation Unit 50 *Prescribing, recording, and reporting photon beam therapy*. Bethesda, Md: International Commission on Radiation Units and Measurements 1993.
15. International Commission On Radiation Units And Measurements. ICRU report 62: prescribing, recording, and reporting photon beam therapy (supplement to ICRU report 50). Bethesda: ICRU 1999.
16. International Commission On Radiation Unit 83. Prescribing recording, and reporting intensity-modulated photon-beam therapy (IMRT)(ICRU Report 83). *Journal Of The ICRU* 2010; 10 (1).
17. Marks L B, Yorke E D, Jackson A, Ten Haken R K, Constine L S, Eisbruch A, et al. Use of normal tissue complication probability models in the clinic. *International Journal of Radiation Oncology• Biology• Physics*. 2010;76(3):S10-9.
18. Zayat D M A, Attalla E M, Abouelenein H S, Shady, F, Wafaa, K. (2015). Dosimetric Comparison of Intensity-Modulated Radiotherapy versus 3D Conformal Radiotherapy in Patients with Head and Neck Cancer. *Physica Medica*, 31, S1
19. Knisely J P, Baehring J M. A silver lining on the horizon for glioblastoma. *The lancet oncology*. 2009; 10(5):434-5.
20. Horber E. *Link to resources on SPSS*. [online] 2017. <http://www.unige.ch/ses/sococ/cl/edoc/spsresources.html>. Last accessed on 28 March 2018
21. Fogliata A, Clivio A, Nicolini G, et al. Intensity modulation with photons for benign intracranial tumours: a planning comparison of volumetric single arc, helical arc and fixed gantry techniques. *Radiotherapy and Oncology* 2008; 89 (3): 254-262.

Illustrations

Table 1. *Statistics for NBT data (Gy)*

	NBT Mean		NBT Max		NBT 1/3		NBT 2/3	
	<u>IMAT</u>	<u>3DCRT</u>	<u>IMAT</u>	<u>3DCRT</u>	<u>IMAT</u>	<u>3DCRT</u>	<u>IMAT</u>	<u>3DCRT</u>
No. of Plans	16		16		16		16	
Mean \pm 1SD	34.44 \pm 8.47	33.30 \pm 8.65	62.73 \pm 0.66	63.76 \pm 1.18	44.27 \pm 12.34	45.47 \pm 13.16	23.02 \pm 11.29	20.72 \pm 13.36
Range	23→48	21→49	62→64	62→67	27→60	22→60	5→42	2→45
Difference/ (SS)	+1.14 (p= 0.047)		-1.03 (p= 0.004)		-1.2 (p= 0.054)		+2.3 (p= 0.134)	

Abbreviations: SD = Standard Deviation, SS = Statistical Significance

**Values are expressed as p-value (p=), mean \pm 1 standard deviation or as mean value according to data distribution shown in Table 1

Illustrations

Table 2. Statistics for PTV data (Gy)

	PTV Mean		PTV Max		PTV D50		PTV D20	
	<u>IMAT</u>	<u>3DCRT</u>	<u>IMAT</u>	<u>3DCRT</u>	<u>IMAT</u>	<u>3DCRT</u>	<u>IMAT</u>	<u>3DCRT</u>
No. of Plans	16		16		16		16	
Mean ± 1SD	59.91 ± 0.06	59.98 ± 0.98	63.30 ± 0.58	64.69 ± 1.23	59.98 ± 0.08	60.68 ± 0.53	60.48 ± 0.33	61.84 ± 0.76
Range	59.8→60	57.1→61.2	62.4→64.2	62.5→67.8	59.8→60.1	59.9→61.8	60.1→61.5	60.3→63.2
Difference/ (SS)	-0.07 (p= 0.328)		-1.39 (p=0.001)		-0.7 (p=0.001)		-1.36 (p=0.002)	

Abbreviations: SD = Standard Deviation, SS = Statistical Significance

**Values are expressed as p-value (p=), mean ± 1 standard deviation or as mean value according to data distribution shown in Table 2

Illustrations

Table 3. Statistics for OAR data (Gy)

	Brainstem Mean		Brainstem Max		Optic Chiasm Mean		Optic Chiasm Max	
	<u>IMAT</u>	<u>3DCRT</u>	<u>IMAT</u>	<u>3DCRT</u>	<u>IMAT</u>	<u>3DCRT</u>	<u>IMAT</u>	<u>3DCRT</u>
No. of Plans	16		16		15		15	
Mean ±	29.52 ±	27.13 ±	42.62 ±	42.64 ±	36.91 ±	35.23 ±	39.50 ±	38.73 ±
1SD	17.20	17.50	18.38	18.12	19.78	20.77	20.23	21.90
Range	2.2→50	1.2→49.7	5.8→53.9	4.0→55.5	4.2→52.8	1.8→53.9	5.0→56.7	2.2→54.4
Difference/ (SS)	+2.39 (p= 0.044)		-0.02 (p=0.691)		+1.68 (p=0.191)		+0.77 (p=0.691)	

Abbreviations: SD = Standard Deviation, SS = Statistical Significance

**Values are expressed as p-value (p=), mean ± 1 standard deviation or as mean value according to data distribution shown in Table 3.


Illustrations

Table 4. Tolerance doses used for creating treatment plans

Organ At Risk	Tolerance Dose	Endpoint
Brainstem	Max <54Gy	Severe neurological effects
Optic Chiasm	Max <55Gy	Optic neuropathy/ Blindness
NBT (1/3)	Max <60Gy	Symptomatic necrosis
NBT (2/3)	Max <50Gy	Symptomatic necrosis
NBT (3/3)	Max <45Gy	Symptomatic necrosis

Adapted from department protocols and Marks et al.¹⁷

Illustrations



Illustrations

Dose delivered to Normal Brain Tissue (NBT) 3DCRT vs IMAT




Figure 2. Boxplot illustrating statistics for NBT data

Illustrations

Dose delivered to Planning Target Volume (PTV) 3DCRT vs IMAT




Figure 3. Boxplot illustrating statistics for PTV data

Illustrations

Dose delivered to Organs at Risk (OAR) 3DCRT vs IMAT





Figure 4. Boxplot illustrating statistics for OAR data

Figure 5. Illustrates the same axial slice of treatment plan 3 for both techniques, (a) 3DCRT and (b) IMAT. A larger volume of the NBT is receiving dose, using IMAT.

Illustrations

Treatment plan 1, illustrating more dose delivered with IMAT to the NBT.



Treatment plan 4, illustrating more dose delivered with 3DCRT to the NBT




Figure 6. Illustrates the DVHs of the NBT for two different treatment plans.

Treatment plan 1; \square =IMAT, Δ =3DCRT. Treatment plan 4; \square =3DCRT, Δ =IMAT

Illustrations




Figure 7. Illustrates the poor PTV coverage and conformity of the PTV using the 3DCRT technique, compared to the IMAT technique, due to the presence of the optic chiasm.

(a)= 3DCRT, Green line = Optic chiasm, Orange line = Brainstem.

(b)= IMAT, Purple line = Optic chiasm, Pink line = Brainstem.

Blue line= PTV in both treatment plans.

Reviewer #1: Comments	Response
The author's institutions are listed as 1 for the first and second author however SHU is given the designation of 2	Amended as requested
The word image is used in the title, abstract, and body of the report however there is no imaging analysis or modulation in the report. Consider changing this to intensity or volumetric (VMAT).	Changed to VMAT as suggested.
There are typographical errors in the results section of the abstract where ($p=0,004$ & $p=0,0001$) the commas should be a periods (. not ,)	Corrected
The reference (2) by Gould is an online review of the Shaffer (13) article and mentions VMAT not image modulated arc therapy. This is also not a peer reviewed article.	Have changed as it not accessible.
References (2, 4, 14, 15, 21) are not considered to be suitable as they are not peer reviewed or accessible by the reader. Reference 21 is repeated	Amended, 14 and 15 were department protocols hence not externally accessible. These have been removed from the reference list and in text citations.
Reference 20 is quite dated (24 years old) there are more recent applicable references to cite.	Changed to a recent one.
Indicate why you have chosen D50 and D20 as values to compare for your article. Most literature compare D98, D50 and D2 values.	D50= Median dose to PTV, ICRU 83 D20= Highest dose received by 20% of the PTV. D20 was evaluated as a measure of the homogeneity of the dose within the PTV, according to department protocol; the maximum dose, Dmax, was used rather than D98 as this metric is used in the department protocol.
Spelling of optimization in the limitations sections should be changed to optimisation	Corrected

Reviewer #2: Comments	Response
Please select only 5 key words to comply with house style	Selected only 5
Please check affiliation of second author and add an address for corresponding author, landline and email address here.	Added
Please reconsider some of your references as some of them are old and there have been some more recent papers supporting your points that you can also cite-the references need to be checked as one is repeated.	Checked references, repeat had been removed and more recent ones have been included removing the old ones.
For all references please check-ref 1 add city and country of publication , ref 2 and all online refe add last date accessed.	Amended by adding last accessed date on online references and adding the publication details etc on reference 1.
For all refs with 3 names and then et al, the Journals style is to name all the first 6 authors and if there are more then use et al.	Corrected as requested.
Please check your figures and tables-is table 4 referred to in the text anywhere?	Checked and revised, table 4 has been removed.
In the methods section you say 'All patients immobilised supine -can you add a sentence to say how?	Added more detail.
Please clarify why you have chose D50 etc.	D50= Median dose to PTV, ICRU 83 D20= Highest dose received by 20% of the PTV. D20 was evaluated as a measure of the homogeneity of the dose within the PTV, according to department protocol; the maximum dose, Dmax, was used rather than D98 as this metric is used in the department protocol.
In the IMAT planning section please add the name, city and country of manufacturer after the treatment planning system (again this is convention)	Added the requested information.